



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/627,177	07/27/2000	Mark David Nielsen	AUS9-2000-0294-US1	1262
35525	7590	06/04/2004	EXAMINER	
DUKE W. YEE CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P. P.O. BOX 802334 DALLAS, TX 75380			SHAH, NILESH R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2127	

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/627,177

Applicant(s)

NIELSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Nilesh R Shah

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following claim language is not clearly define:

4. As per claim 1, line 4 it is unclear what or where the target object is pointing to? (i.e. does the target point to the source, a third party or some other value?), line 6 has the same problem; line 7, it is uncertain which "value holder" the applicant is referring to. (i.e. does the value holder refer to target value holder (line 3) or the source value holder (line 5)?
5. As per claims 9, 15, 23, 29 and 30 have similar problems as to claim 1 above.
6. As per claim 2, line 4 it is unclear what target is being removed. (i.e. is it the target or the target value?). Line 6 has the same problem.

7. The following terms lack antecedent basics:
 - a. The “new target” claims 2-5.
 - b. The “old target value” claims 2-5,8.
 - c. The “collection” claims 2-5.
8. Claims 10-14 are rejected based on the same rejections for claims 2, 5-8 above.
9. Claims 16-22 are rejected based on the same rejections for claims 2-8 above.
10. Claims 24- 28 are rejected based on the same rejections for claims 2, 5-8 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2127

12. Claims 1- 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shackelford et al. (5,511,196) (hereinafter Shackelford) in view of Reuss et al (5,579,318) (hereinafter Reuss)

13. As per claim 1 Shackelford teaches a method of updating an object association between a source object and a target object (col. 3 line 61 –col. 4 line 55). Shackelford does not specifically teach the use of updating a source to identify the target.

Reuss teaches the use of updating a target value holder of the target to identify the source object, the target value holder comprising a value holder that the target object points to (col. 12 lines 25-35,col. 3 lines 46-56, col. 5 lines 39-42, col. 6 lines 27-45); and updating a source value holder of the source to identify the target, the source value holder comprising a value holder that they source points to (col. 3 lines 46-56, col. 5 lines 39-42, col. 6 lines 27-45, col. 13 lines 5-24); and wherein a value holder is an object that wrappers a target or source in order to implement a proxy pattern (col. 3 line 61 –col. 4 line 55).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Reuss and Shackelford because Reuss's updating of the source would improve Shackelford's object oriented system by being able to have not only the target but also the source with the most updated information.

14. As per claim 2, Shackelford teaches a method wherein if the object association is a one to one object association (col. 3 line 61 –col. 4 line 55).

Reuss teaches the use of setting the new target in the target value holder from the source (col. 12 lines 25-40, col. 9 lines 9-13); and

removing the target from the old target value holder in the source, if the collection already contains the target and the step of updating the source value holder includes removing the source from the old source value holder in the target, if the collection already contains the source and

setting the new source in the source value holder from the target (col. 3 lines 46-56, col. 5 lines 39-42, col. 6 lines 27-45, col. 13 lines 5-24).

15. As per claim 3, Shackelford teaches a method wherein if the object association is a one to many object associations (col. 3 line 61 –col. 4 line 55).

Reuss teaches the use of adding the new target to the target value holder collection from the source, if the collection does not already contain the target (col. 12 lines 25-35, col. 9 lines 9-13);

and the step of updating the source value holder includes removing the source from the old source value holder in the target, if the collection already contains the source and setting the new source in the source value holder from the target (col. 12 lines 25-35, col. 3 lines 46-56, col. 5 lines 39-42, col. 6 lines 27-45).

16. As per claim 4, Shackelford teaches a method wherein if the object association is a many to one object association (col. 3 line 61 –col. 4 line 55).

Reuss teaches the use setting the new target in the target value holder from the source, and removing the target from the old target value holder collection in the source, if the collection already contains the target (col. 12 lines 25-35,col. 3 lines 46-56); and the step of updating the source value holder includes adding the new source to the source value holder collection from the target, if the collection does not already contain the source (col. 5 lines 39-42, col. 6 lines 27-45).

17. As per claim 5, Shackelford teaches a method wherein if the object association is a many to many object association (col. 3 line 61 –col. 4 line 55).

Reuss teaches the use of adding the new target to the target value holder collection from the source, if the collection does not already contain the target and the step of updating the source value holder (col. 12 lines 25-35,col. 3 lines 46-56, col. 5 lines 39-42, col. 6 lines 27-45); and adding the new source to the source value holder collection from the target, if the collection does not already contain the source (col.12 lines 25-35, col. 9 lines 9-13).

18. As per claim 6, As per claim 5, Shackelford teaches a method of updating an object association between a source object and a target object (col. 3 line 61 –col. 4 line 55). Reuss teaches a method wherein the value holder includes a method for setting source and target to be wrapped by the value holder, and a method for returning source and target wrapped by the value holder (col. 12 lines 25-35,col. 3 lines 46-56, col. 5 lines 39-42, col. 6 lines 27-45).
19. As per claim 7, Shackelford teaches a method of data processing objects implemented in Java, C++, Smalltalk, Eiffel, or other object oriented language (col. 1 lines 11-64). Reuss teaches the use of updating a target and updating a source are performed using a value holder (col 12 lines 25-35, col. 9 lines 9-13).
20. As per claim 8, Reuss teaches a method wherein the value holder receives as input parameters one or more of: a value holder that an old, source currently points to, a value holder that an old target currently points to, a value holder that a source currently points to, a value holder that a target currently points to, a source value, a target value, a source cardinality; and a target cardinality (col. 12 lines 25-35,col. 3 lines 46-56, col. 5 lines 39-42, col. 6 lines 27-45).
21. Claims 9-14 are rejected based on the same rejections for claims 1,2, 5-8 above.

Art Unit: 2127

22. Claims 15-22 are rejected based on the same rejections for claims 1-8 above.

23. Claims 23- 28 are rejected based on the same rejections for claims 1,2, 5-8 above.

24. Claim 29 and 30 are rejected based on the same rejection as claim 1 above.

Conclusion

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2127

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh R Shah whose telephone number is 703-305-8105.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NS
May 28, 2004



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100